REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of the Drawings

Applicant has amended Figures 2, 3 and 4 to provide better clarity.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 2 through 17 and claims 19 through 31 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 18. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 31. Applicants have canceled claims 2, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22 and 30.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended these claims to correct the cited informalities.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended this claim 5 to better clarify the invention.

Claims 1-2, 6-9, 13-19, 23-26, 28 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hung (U.S. Patent 6,772,143). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion.

Applicants' invention describes a method and system for storing information into a folder/location using a predictive function to select the name for the newly stored information. The predictive functions use names of applications, documents or words within these items to select and present a name to a user. Each time a document is saved to a storage medium, a predictive function will cause the selection of the most probable folder/location in which the document would be stored. This selection can occur even when multiple folders match a set of identifiers.

Hung describes a method and system for management of messages. Upon receipt of a message, or at another time, the machine may automatically extract a parameter value from the message and create a new folder for storing messages that match that parameter value. The machine may thus store the message, and other messages that match the parameter value, in the folder. Alternatively, the machine may present the

message to a user and allow a user to select one or more values from the message, to be used as a filter for a folder. The machine may then store the message, and other messages that match the filter, in the folder.

Although Hung implements some of the same features as Applicants' present invention, Hung does not provide for the situation when more than one folder matches the description of the message to be stored. Applicants' present invention does provide for this situation. Applicants, in paragraph [0025] define four scenarios for which the present invention addresses. The first scenario is when the predictive process finds one storage location entry matching the search criteria for storing the file. The second scenario is when the predictive process finds multiple storage location entries that match the search criteria for storing the file. The third scenario is when no matches are found for the search criteria. The fourth scenario is when the user has a specific location where they want to store a particular file. In this fourth scenario, the user can override the predictive process of the present invention. As part of predictive process and to account for the case when multiple folders match the search criteria, folders in the index that match the search criteria are initially marked. This marking enables the process to determine when multiple files match the search criteria.

Hung describes a method that compares the message string to the folders in a table. However, in Hung, page 10, lines 7 through 15 discuss looking to the first match and concluding that the message belongs in that folder.

Applicants have amended claims provide for marking an entry in the folder index having an identifier that matches the file identifier. The examiner asserted in that Hung discloses this marking step and the step of determining whether there is more than one entity matching the file identifier. However, this assertion is not supported by the Hung reference. The locations in the reference cited by the examiner do not describe the scenario of multiple entries matching the file identifier. Further, Hung does not discuss the marking of entries in the table. The reason for no discussion is that Hung does not anticipate the multiple matching entries scenario.

12

Contrary to the examiner's statement that all elements are disclosed in the cited reference, Hung, the elements of: marking an entry having an identifier that matches the file identifier and determining whether there are more entries in the index to compare with the identifier of the file to be stored; are not, therefore the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 10, 12, 20, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hung as applied to claims 1 and 18 and further in view of Bhide (U.S. Patent 6,564,214). The examiner asserts that Hung discloses the elements of claims 1 and 18 disclose the step of marking a storage entry having an identifier that matches the file identifier. Examiner further asserts that Bhide discloses a unique matching string with lookup search. As previously stated, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Hung does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of marking a folder entry. As stated, hung does not contemplate or discuss the situation of having multiple folder entries that match a search criteria.

Applicants submit that a combining of Hung with Bhide will not produce Applicants' present invention.

Claims 4-5 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hung as applied to claims 1 and 18 and further in view of Binning (U.S. Published application 2004/0214554). The examiner asserts that Hung discloses the elements of claims 1 and 18 disclose the step of marking a storage entry having an identifier that matches the file identifier. As previously stated, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Hung does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of marking a folder entry. As stated, hung does not contemplate or discuss the situation of having multiple folder entries that match a search criteria. Further, Binning discloses an online directory system that provides relatively comprehensive and up-to-date information relating to users and their corresponding cellular telephone numbers and/or wireless pager numbers. Although, Binning does discuss the search for information, the Binning system is for retrieving information and not for determining a location to store information.

In order to establish a prima facie case for obviousness, there must be a suggestion or teaching to modify (combine) the references. If there is no teaching, there is

no pima facia case for obviousness. Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Hung to modify it based on the teachings in Binning, therefore, there is no prima facia case for obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,

Darcell Walker
Reg. No. 34,945
9301 Southwest Freeway, Suite 250
Houston, Texas 77074
713-772-1255
June 12, 2006